

DEC 08 2006

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action of June 13, 2006 has been given careful consideration by the applicants. Claims 1-22 remain in the application. Reconsideration of the present application is hereby respectfully requested.

**The Office Action**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 12 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,408,177 to Parikh.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2-3, 7-11, 13-14 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Parikh and U.S. Patent No. 6,889,044 to Cook.

**The Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the Cited Patents**

The Examiner again rejected claims 1, 4-6, 12 and 15-17 as being anticipated by Parikh. However, as previously set forth, these claims are not anticipated by the cited patent.

Briefly, in Parikh, all calls that are placed to subscribers of a call management service are directed to a call management system. It is apparent from Figure 5 that, once the call is received by the call management system, a variety of functions are performed. Among these functions is a determination of whether the call is anonymous. Notably, it is submitted that all subscriber calls are forwarded to the call management system of Parikh and are received by the call management system, whether such calls are anonymous or not. The determination of anonymity is conducted after being received in the call management system.

In contrast, claims 1 and 12 recite that the presently described embodiments perform a function of forwarding a call to an intelligent peripheral if the call is an anonymous call. Prior to this forwarding, there is a determination made as to whether the call is anonymous. Therefore, this recitation of forwarding the call to an intelligent peripheral if the call is an anonymous call is distinguishable from Parikh, wherein all subscriber calls are forwarded to a separate network element, i.e., the call management system.

The Examiner argues that the claims do not recite that a determination that a call is anonymous is made "prior to forwarding." However, the claims state that the call is forwarded to an intelligent peripheral if the call is an anonymous call. It is

submitted that a fair reading of the claims supports the above-recited distinctions over the cited art. The Examiner indicates that, under a broad reading of the claims, the intelligent peripheral may "determine" or "forward"; however, it is submitted that it is not a fair reading that would require the intelligent peripheral to forward the call to itself.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 12 are not anticipated by Parikh. Likewise, all claims dependent thereon, including claims 4-6 and 15-17, are not anticipated by the Parikh patent.

The Examiner also again rejected claims 2-3, 7-11, 13-14 and 18-22 as being obvious over Parikh and Cook. However, the suggested portions of Cook do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Parikh – whether or not other claim recitations may or may not be met by Cook. Therefore, these claims are not rendered obvious by the suggested combination.

Indeed, as previously argued, if the Parikh and Cook patents were somehow combined, the resultant combination would lack the functionality of forwarding calls to an intelligent peripheral if the call is an anonymous call. In the suggested combination, it is submitted that all subscriber calls would be forwarded to some sort of network element, without filtering out only anonymous calls. As such, the suggested combination does not render the claims 2-3, 7-11, 13-14 and 18-22 obvious.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 08 2006

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-22) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to telephone Joseph D. Dreher, at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLPDecember 8, 2006

Date



Joseph D. Dreher

Reg. No. 37,123

1100 Superior Avenue

Seventh Floor


Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☒ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature 
Date December 8, 2006	Printed Name Roseanne Giuliani

N:\LUTZ\200239\RLG0006385V001.doc